DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 244 895 SO 015 699

AUTHOR McIntosh, Peggy
TITLE Interactive Phases of Curricular Re-Vision: A Feminist Perspective. Working Paper No. 124.
INSTITUTION Wellesley Coll., Mass. Center for Research on Women.
SPONS AGENCY Andrew W. Mellon Foundation, New York, N.Y.; Anna Wilder Phelps Fund, Chicago, IL.
PUB DATE 83
NOTE 36p.; For related documents on women and university courses, see SO 015 695-698.
AVAILABLE FROM Center for Research on Women, Wellesley College, Wellesley, MA 02181 ($3.50).
PUB TYPE Viewpoints (120)

EDRS PRICE MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS Course Content; *Curriculum Design; Curriculum Development; Females; *Feminism; Higher Education; History Instruction; Sex Bias; *Sex Fairness; Womens Education; Womens Studies
IDENTIFIERS Feminist Criticism

ABSTRACT

Presented from a feminist perspective, the document describes five interactive phases of curricular revision. Each phase occupies a different level on a "broken pyramid" hierarchical structure representing different ways in which women are included in curriculum. In such a structure, winners are few and near the peak; losers many and nearer to the bottom. Examples from the study of history serve to describe the five phases. In phase 1, "womanless history" would be history that focuses not on the vast majority of the world's population (woman and nonwhite males), but rather on a privileged class of men in the western world. In phase 2, "women in history," historians focus on more women than phase 1, but only on a famous few. Phase 3 acknowledges more women than phases 1 and 2 but acknowledges women not as part of the norm, but as a problem for the scholar, the society, or the world of the powerful. Phase 4, "women as history," includes more women that the previous stages and explores all life beyond the public world of winning and losing, into private, invisible, and domestic spheres. Curriculum revision in phase 5, the hardest to achieve, redefines and reconstructs history to include women collectively, based on global imagery of self and society rather than on a winning-losing pyramid. The document concludes with hypothetical examples (told in storytelling format) of young women encountering these five interactive phases of curriculum development in five specific disciplines (English literature, psychology, biology, art history, and history). (LH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED244895

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☒ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Peggy McIntosh

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

INTERACTIVE PHASES OF CURRICULAR RE-VISION: A FEMINIST PERSPECTIVE

I want to speculate here about a theory of five interactive phases of personal and curriculum change which occur when new perspectives and new materials from Women's Studies are brought into a traditional curriculum or a traditional consciousness. After a number of years of work in curriculum revision involving Women's Studies, I found that my colleagues and I were frequently making judgments without having made the grounds of our judgments explicit. That is, we were seeing some efforts of curriculum revision as better than others, more advanced along a spectrum of curricular possibilities which had not yet been described. My theory is an attempt to describe the spectrum.

Such theories have their dangers. Typologies scare me because abstract schema have so often left out most people, including me. Stage theories in particular are dangerous because they can so easily reinforce present hierarchies of power and value. Nevertheless, I want to speak in terms of curricular phases here, partly because colleagues in Women's Studies on many campuses are making similar analyses, speaking and writing about the process of curriculum change as if we could see in it identifiable varieties and types of change. "Such and such a course still has a long way to go," we say. A long way toward what? This is what I will try to spell out here. I like the tentativeness with which others interested in stage or phase theories in this field have drawn their pictures. D'Ann Campbell, Gerda Lerner, Catherine Stimpson, Marcia Westkott and the faculty development team of Arch, Tetrault, and Kirschner at Lewis and Clark College have developed

theories that do not entail ranking and labeling of a sort which perpetuates oppression and exclusion. I take them as models.

For my own analysis, I have adopted, instead of the word "stages," the phrase suggested by Prof. Joan Gunderson of St. Olaf College: "interactive phases." Initial phases of perception do not disappear, but can be felt continually in the mind or the discipline, as one moves toward or away from a more inclusive body of knowledge, a more active process of learning, and a greater ability to see the dominant modes of thought and behavior which we wish to challenge or change.

I begin also with a sense of indebtedness to many other colleagues, including especially the women and men who have taken part over the last four years in the Mellon Seminars at the Wellesley College Center for Research on Women. These seminars are focused on liberal arts curriculum re-vision in two senses: re-seeing and re-making of the liberal arts curriculum. Each year, the Mellon Seminar participants meet together once a month for five hours to consider each of their academic areas or disciplines in turn. The questions we ask in that seminar for each discipline are the same: "What is the present content and scope and methodology of the discipline?" (Or, to use a phrase of Elizabeth Minnich's: "What are the shaping dimensions of the discipline at present?") And then, "How would the discipline need to change to reflect the fact that women are half the world's population and have had, in one sense, half the world's experience?"

The phases in curricular revision which I will describe owe their conceptualization in part to the work of the seminar. Sometimes after a presentation, a member of this group will say, "We really can't get any

further in my field on this question." Or "I think you can get further ahead in Religion than we can in Philosophy; we can't make most women's experience visible, given the self-definition of the field." There is a sense among the seminar members that degrees of change do exist in the process of curriculum transformation. I will trace here what I think are the types of curriculum corresponding to five phases of perception.

In naming the five phases I will use history as the first example. I call Phase 1 Womanless History; Phase 2 Women in History; Phase 3 Women as a Problem, Anomaly, or Absence in History; Phase 4 Women As History; and Phase 5 History Redefined or Reconstructed to Include Us All.

Analogously, we can have Womanless Political Science, then Women in Politics, then Women as an Absence, Anomaly or Problem for Political Science (or in Politics); next, Women as Political, (the study of women's lives in all their political dimensions, or, to use a phrase from Elizabeth Janeway's, The Powers of the Weak, or the politics of the family, the school, the neighborhood, and the curriculum, the politics of culture, class, race and sex); and finally, Politics Redefined or Reconstructed to include mutliple spheres of power, inner and outer.

Or we can have Womanless Biology, followed by (great) Women in Biology. Here, Phase 2 tends to be about a few of the few who had access to lab equipment, a handful of women still remembered for their work. In Phase 3 we have Women as Problems or Absences or Anomalies in Biology, for example as analyzed in the collection of essays called Women Look at Biology Looking at Women. In Phase 4 we have women taking the initiative to do science in a new way, on a differing base of assumptions and

finally, we can imagine Biology Reconstructed to Include Us All.

The Phase 1 syllabus is very exclusive; Phase 4 and 5 syllabi are very inclusive. Individuals and courses do not, as I have said, exist in fixity in given phases, but will show points of dynamic interaction among several of the phases, if the teacher or researcher is conscious of the magnitude of the problem of women's invisibility, and of the many forms of the problem. I think that superficial curriculum change gets arrested in what I have called Phases 2 and 3.

In proposing these phases of curriculum change, I may seem to be creating yet another ladder of values and arranging things so that Phase 1 is the bottom and Phase 5 is the top. This is not quite so; in one respect it is the reverse of what I intend, and what I see in my mind's eye. For Phase 1 thinking reinforces what we have been taught is the "top" and Phase 4 corresponds to what we have been taught is the "bottom" according to present hierarchies of knowledge, power and validity. Phase 5 puts what we were taught to devalue and to value into a new revolutionary relation to each other.

For me, the varieties of curriculum change in order to be accurately understood need to be set against models of the larger society and should be overlaid on an image of a broken pyramid. This image has come for me to stand for our culture as a whole. In my imagination it represents our institutions and also our individual psyches. I want to spend some time now developing this image of the broken pyramid and setting what I see as phases or types of curriculum development against the background of that image.

The upper part of the broken pyramid consists of peaks and

pinnacles, peaks and pinnacles particularly in the public institutional life of nations, of governments, of militia, universities, churches, and corporations. Survival in this world is presented to us as a matter of winning lest you lose. We are taught to see both our institutions and ourselves within this framework: either you are a winner or you are among the losers. The winners are few, and high up on narrow bits of land which are the peaks; the losers are many and are low down, closer to the bottom. Institutions, groups, and individuals are seen as being on their way to the bottom if they are not on their way to the top.

The mountainous and pyramidal form of our society and of our psyches is a social construct invented by us. The shape of the pyramid was not necessarily inherent in the human materials but developed in our minds, and has now become reified, not only in our minds but in our institutions and in our behavior. We are taught that civilization has a clear top and a clear bottom. The liberal arts curriculum has been particularly concerned with passing on to students the image of what the "top" has been.

Both our public institutions and collective as well as innermost psyches have taken on the hierarchical structure of this winning-versus-losing kind of paradigm. Those who climb up get power; we are taught that there is not power for the many but there is power at the top for those few who can reach the peaks and pinnacles. College liberal arts catalogues, which package liberal arts education for sale to incoming students and to parents of students, make the claim that colleges help students to realize themselves, to discover their

individual uniquenesses and to develop confidence which will lead to achievement, accomplishment, and success in the world outside the university. Most of this language masks, I think, the actual liberal arts function which is, at present, to train a few students to climb up to pinnacles and to seize them so as to have a position from which power can be felt, enjoyed, exercised and imposed on others. Images of upward mobility for the individual pervade the admissions literature of most of our colleges and universities today. We are taught that the purpose of education is to assist us in climbing up those peaks and pinnacles to enjoy the "fulfillment of our potential," which I take to mean the increased ability to have and use power for our individual selves.

As I have said, we are taught that only a few will be able to wield power from the summits. Behind the talk about scholarly excellence and teaching is hidden a voice that says: "The territory of excellence is very small. Only a few will be allowed to gain the peaks, having had access to excellent teaching and having earned excellent grades." A few will be "winners," perhaps featured in the subject matter of future courses, as winners in the history of the world -- those worthy of the limelight. A few will be tenured and promoted in the pyramid of the college or the university or in the pyramids of legal, medical, financial, and governmental institutions, but the rest in some sense or other are made to be or feel like losers. The words "success," "achievement," and "accomplishment" have been defined in such a way as to leave most people and most types of life out of the picture.

Now, Womanless History is characteristic of thinking which reflects

the society's pyramidal winning-vs.-losing mentality. Phase 1 curriculum in the United States reflects only the highest levels of the existing pyramids of power and value. Womanless History specializes in telling about those who had most public power and whose lives were involved with laws, wars, acquisition of territory, and management of power. History is usually construed, in other words, to exclude those who didn't possess a good deal of public power. This kind of history perfectly reinforces the dominant political and social systems in that nonwhite males and women, the vast majority of the world's population, are construed as not worth studying in a serious and sustained way, and not worth including in the version of reality passed on to students.

Womanless History, in other words, is about "winning" and has been written by the "winners." Feminist analysts of that version of reality have come to realize that a privileged class of men in western culture have defined what is power and what constitutes knowledge. Excluded from these definitions and hence from consideration in the traditional History curriculum are types of power and versions of knowledge which this privileged class of men does not share. Hence a corrective is called for if the definitions of power and knowledge are to become more complete.

At first glance, the Phase 2 corrective, Women in History, appears to be an improvement over Phase 1, but Phase 2 History is very problematical for me and for many of my colleagues. I have come to think that it is worse than the traditional curriculum, worse than Womanless History in that it pretends to show us "women" but really shows us only a famous few, or makes a place for a newly-declared or a newly-resurrected famous

few. It is problematical to argue against Phase 2 history at a time when many are concerned that young women have something up there on the pinnacles for them to look at and when many others want to restore to women of the past a historical record which has been taken from them. But Phase 2 is all too often like an affirmative action program which implies that institutions are model places which need only to help a few of the "inferior" Others to have the opportunity to climb onto these pinnacles with their "superiors." Affirmative action programs rarely acknowledge that the dominant group can and should learn from the Other. Phase 2 curricular policies, like most affirmative action programs, assume that our disciplines are basically functioning well, and that all that women or Blacks or Chicanos could need or want is to be put into higher slots on the reading list. In other words, the World Civilization course just needs a little attention to Africa, as a disadvantaged culture, giving Africa the time of day but from a position of "noblesse oblige."

In Phage 2 History the historians' spotlight is simply trained a little lower than usual on the pinnacles, so that we see people like Susan B. Anthony trying to scramble up the rocks. Anthony is featured as a hero in that she tried to make it into men's territory and succeeded. And she gets on the silver dollar. But there were all the other women on behalf of whom she was speaking whose lives remain completely invisible to us. That's the trouble with Phase 2 History. It conveys to the student the impression that women don't really exist unless they are exceptional by men's standards. Women don't really exist unless we "make something of ourselves" in the public world. Phase 2 History or

Literature or Science or Economics repeatedly features the famous or "notable" or salaried women. In the American Literature course on 19th Century America, Emerson's friend Margaret Fuller may get added to the syllabus, but all the women of Emerson's family, as representative of the women whose unseen labor made possible that transcendental obliviousness to daily life, get left out. You never see in English courses anything about all the women who were preparing Emerson's meals while he wrote "Self Reliance." In Phase 2 History we particularly see consorts featured. Sometimes they are neutered consorts like Betsy Ross who is seen as a sort of asexual "forefather:" Sometimes you see a woman who is both a public figure and a consort, like Cleopatra, or a consort manquée, like Queen Elizabeth. But very rarely do you get a sense of all that substructure of the culture composed of women who didn't "make it" into the spheres of power, and who did not furnish material for myths. And almost always (or quite often) the women who did "make it" are devalued in the historical record by being portrayed chiefly in terms of sexual relationships. Phase 2 thinking never recognizes "ordinary" life, unpaid labor, or "unproductive" phenomena like human friendship.

Phase 3 takes us further down from the pinnacles of power toward the valleys. It brings us in touch with most women, and makes us realize that curriculum change which addresses only discrimination against women or "barriers" to women hardly begins to get at the major problems we have faced and the major experiences we have had. Phase 3 introduces us to the politics of the curriculum. We can't simply "include" those who were left out, who were "denied opportunity" to be

studied. It's not an accident we were left out. And as Marilyn Schuster, a Dean at Smith College, has said: "First you study women to fill in the gaps, but then it becomes more complicated because you see that the gaps were there for a reason."

Phase 3 curriculum work involves getting angry at the fact that we have been seen only as an absence, an anomaly or a problem for History, for English, for Biology, rather than as part of the world, part of whatever people have chosen to value. There is anger at the way women have been treated throughout history. We are angry that instead of being seen as part of the norm, we have been see, if at all, as a "problem" for the scholar, the society, or the world of the powerful. People doing scholarship in Women's Studies get particularly angry at the fact that the terms of academic discourse and of research are loaded in such a way that we are likely to come out looking like "losers" or looking like pathological cases. A teacher at one of the Claremont Colleges has eloquently asked, "How can we alter the making and the finding of knowledge in such a way that difference needn't be perceived as deprivation?" Phase 3 work makes us angry that women are seen either as deprived or as exceptional. I think that the anger in Phase 3 work is absolutely vital to us. Disillusionment is also a feature of Phase 3 realizations, for many teachers. It is traumatically shocking to white women teachers in particular to realize that we were not only trained but were as teachers unwittingly training others to overlook, reject, exploit, disregard, or be at war with most people in the world. One feels hoodwinked and also sick at heart at having been such a vehicle for racism, misogyny, upper class power and militarism.

Phase 3 challenges the literary canon. We ask who defined greatness in literature, and who is best served by the definitions? We ask the same in Religion -- who defined "major" theology, and "important" church history? In Music and Art, who defined greatness and whom do the definitions best serve? Both the definers and those best served by the definitions were Western white men who had positions of cultural power or who fared fairly well within cultural systems.

In Phase 3, scholars rankle against statements like this which as freshmen they might have taken for granted: "The quest for knowledge is a universal human undertaking." "Economic behavior is a matter of choice." "Man has mastered the environment and harnessed the resources of the planet." We may laugh today, but as freshmen, we didn't laugh. We just abosrbed these ideas.

Once when I was a Freshman, the present personality in me, then a hidden part of the psyche, below the winning and losing part, spoke up -- just once, six weeks into a freshman social science course on the History of the Church in Western Civilization. I suddenly blurted out something I hadn't meant to say at all. It was that voice which is now speaking to you directly today, briefly speaking then, 26 years ago. I was in a small discussion section which accompanied one of the Harvard lecture courses. The "section man," who was a graduate student, was running a discussion on fine points of theology, and on the governance of bishops and kings. Joined with him in this conversation were two dazzling freshmen; one was Reinhold Niebuhr's son, who knew all the fine points of theology; the other was from Pasadena, a tall, god-like man, with a tan and a tennis racket; I remember him as wearing a cream-colored

cable sweater with the two blue and red stripes, and knowing all the fine points of theology, too. I couldn't understand what was going on in any of this course. I had no even begun to learn about the medieval feudal system until I took this course. Then suddenly one day, in the middle of a discussion, I blurted out: "I don't see why the serfs stood for it."

We hadn't even been talking about the serfs. You can imagine the dilemma of the teacher, hearing this utterly irrelevant freshman comment coming from soneome who hadn't said anything for six weeks. He said gently, but in a very sombre voice, "I think you had better see me in office hours." I was of course too scared to go see him in office hours; as one who had not yet noticed how the pyramids of power work, I was afraid of those in authority, and I always hoped that the professors wouldn't notice me. I was humiliated by my comment. I assumed that the others in the class understood how the feudal system worked, and that I was the only one who didn't understand "why the serfs stood for it."

I went through four years at Harvard thinking that everyone else had understood medieval social systems, but then in later years, after I had done some teaching, I began to see further dimensions in that uncontrolled comment. It was coming from a "serf," a freshman girl who was asking not only "Where are the serfs, and where are the women?" but also "Where am I in this picture, and why am I standing for this picture that leaves me out, and this discussion which leaves me out?" Years later I began to see that, uncontrolled though that comment was, it was based on very important material which hadn't been covered in that course about the pinnacles. We never studied the peasant woman on her knees in

Chartres; we only studied Abelard in the streets of Paris and discussed what various intellectual geniuses or power-holders were saying. And the discussion itself was only among the power-holders.

I seems to me now, in retrospect, that if my teacher had really been able to do the kind of systemic teaching which Women's Studies encourages and enables one to do, he could have quickly filled me in on a number of points which would have shed light on the stability of the pyramidal feudal system. He could have mentioned the psychological theory of identification with authority; there was more in it for the serfs to identify upward with the apparent protector than to identify laterally with people who couldn't help them. He could have reminded me that before the Industrial Revolution serfs didn't have telephones, newsletters or political movements to allow them to work for revolution. He could have mentioned the serfs' identification with the Kingdom of Heaven. Years later, I began to realize that all teachers are trained to isolate bits of knowledge and that this very training keeps their students in turn oblivious of the larger systems which hold pyramids of power in place. I was obediently oblivious; having been raised on the American myth of individuality, I thought that there were no social systems anywhere, and then couldn't imagine why a serf wouldn't assert that God-given gift of individuality and make his way out of what I considered to be "the bottom," in the first social system I had ever noticed.

This autobiographical vignette is important to me now, though it shamed me and gnawed at me for years at Harvard. For a long time I thought it was "the stupidist thing I ever said in college," but now that I have flip-flopped the pyramid, I think it was one of the smarter things

I said in college. This inchoate and uncontrolled outburst of the serf against a Harvard education came from a voice which spoke for people and functions of personality which we are trained to disregard.

Phase 3 gives way to Phase 4 at the moment when all of those who were assigned to specialize in the functions of life below the fault-line refuse to see ourselves only as a problem and begin to think of ourselves as valid human beings. Phase 4 vision construes the life below the break in the pyramid as the real though unacknowledged base of life and civilization. In the 4th phase we women say: "On our own ground, we are not losers; we have had half the human experience. The fact that we are different from men and diverse within our own group doesn't necessarily mean we are deprived." Those who embark on Phase 4 thinking find the accepted pyramidal modes of seeing and evaluating are inappropriate to our sense of worth. For within the pyramidal images we can be seen only as being "at the bottom." All of the first three phases of curricular revision which I have described omit that positive look at us which is the crucial healing ingredient of the 4th phase and the chief revolutionary ingredient of the 5th phase. In other words, I see Phases 1, 2 and 3 in varying degrees as misogynist. In Phase 1, we weren't in history; Phase 2 allows that only a few exceptional women were in history; and Phase 3 says we were in history problematically, messing up the purity of the historical model, or making demands and being victimized. Women or men who say only these things have internalized the view of women as problems, or as deviant people with "issues." Such people can demonstrate persistent internalized misogyny in the midst of their righteous and legitimate anger on behalf of wronged women.

Phase 4 is the development in which we see Women As History, and explore all the life existing below the public world of winning and losing. Now I want to go back to the image of the broken pyramid and say that in the top part of the pyramid I drew, the only two alternatives are to win or to lose. But there is another whole domain of the psyche and of the public and private life that works on a different value system or ethical perception altogether. These are a value system and an ethical system which operate laterally on the principle that you work for the decent survival of all, and that this effort conduces to your own survival and your humanity as well. This value system is approved in the spheres we have called private, invisible, and domestic. I cannot claim that families actually work on a lateral model. But mothers are not specifically trained to do with their children something that would involve, for example, marking the children and grading them to see which will win and which will lose. The publicly sanctioned behavior of mothers, though it is partly to make the children adjust to the pyramids in the public spheres, is partly to work for the decent survival of all the children at once. Moreover, the idea of decent survival of all lies behind our friendships and our conversations and much of our daily life as we go about our ordinary business. Most of what we do is on this lateral plane of working for our own decent survival rather than "getting ahead."

Now, the assigned work of women in every culture has chiefly been in this unacknowledged, lateral network of life below the fault-line, supporting the rest of the pyramid but really opposed to it, because lateral consciousness is at odds with the value system of winning versus losing. The two systems have been pitted against each other through

projection onto two "opposite" sexes. The value system of winning and losing has particularly been projected onto white Western man, and men in power in all cultures, and the value system and the work of the part below the break involving decent survival of all has been particularly projected onto women and other lower caste people. However, in the pyramidal configuration, one system is subordinated to the other. The contest is not equal. In Phase 4 thinking, whether in daily life or in curriculum revision, you call into question whether all that work behind the scenes is the work of losers. You ask if it isn't the real work of civilization. And you may also ask whether it isn't the work of the "haves" rather than the "have-nots." That's the moment at which the pyramid in a social construct begins to be seen as the creation of a special interest group. The work of taking care of ourselves and other people can be seen as a role assignment in our society, carrying many rewards and gratifications as well as punishments. If it is seen only as the work of victims, then it is still seen, I believe, in a misogynist way. We who were assigned the work of domestic upkeep and maintenance for the human race and the making of ties and relationships have done in many ways a reasonably good job of it. The race hasn't blown itself up yet. We most need continued work for decent survival of all in a nuclear age. The collaborative values coming out of the base of the pyramid are the ones we desperately need in public policymakers.

We cannot, by wishing, dismantle the upper parts of the pyramid, or bring the unseen base into compatibility with the upper part. The two types of existence are presently in enmity with each other, as two differing value systems of "mastery" and "decency" (or compliance)

projected onto powerful men and onto lower caste people respectively. But we desperately need for the future to try to carry the values from the undervalued sphere into the public spheres, in order to change the behavior and the sense of reality of all of our public institutions and the people who control them. The study of women, like women themselves, can help to supply the vision, the information, and the courage needed for this task, and can thus increase our chances of global and personal survival. I hope you realize that I am not claiming that women are morally superior to men by birth, and hence able to save the world. It is just that we were assigned the task which Jean Baker Miller calls "developing ourselves through the development of others." And that has meant that we have developed skills in keeping the human race alive which are the basic indispensable skills in an age of nuclear weapons.

Curriculum work in Phase 4, when you have begun to construe women as the world majority and see women in some respect as the "haves," not simply the "have nots," breaks all the rules of ordinary research or teaching. One studies American literature of the 19th century not by asking, "Did the women write anything good?" but by asking "What did the women write?" One asks not "What great work by a woman can I include in my reading list?" but "How have women used the written word?" In Phase 4 one asks, "How have women of color in many cultures told their stories?" not "Is there any good third world literature?" Phase 4 looks not at Abelard but at that peasant woman who didn't have any "pure" theology or even understand the heresies, but who rather had an overlay of platitudes and "Old Wives' Tales" and riddles and superstitions and theological scraps from here and there and kitchen wisdom in her mind.

In Phase 4, one looks at the mix of life, and instead of being scared by the impurity of the mix, notices that the impurities reflect the fact that we have been terribly diverse in our lives. Biology taught from a Phase 4 perspective does not define life in terms of the smallest possible units that may be isolated and then examined in isolation. When you are doing Phase 4 Biology, it seems to me you particularly teach reverence for the organism, identification with it, and you see in terms of large, interlocking and relational systems which need to be acknowledged and preserved or whose balance needs to be observed and appreciated.

Many of civilization's present emergencies suggest that we need wider constructions of knowledge in all fields than our present investigators have developed, with their exclusive methods of study, whether empirical or otherwise. All of Phase 4 work is highly speculative and experimental in its epistemology, for we have not yet learned to name unnamed experiences of the plural, the common, the lateral and the "ordinary" life. In Phase 4 curriculum development, it feels as though we are all making it up together. Teachers can look at each other's bibliographies, but this work is so new that we need people to invent their own ways of describing what they are finding, to invent new categories for experience, new ways of doing research, and new ways of teaching.

In Phase 4, most of the teaching materials are non-traditional. Moreover, the boundaries between disciplines start to break down, for scholars doing feminist work come to realize that boundaries between disciplines serve to keep our present political, economic and social arrangements in place. There are a number of other boundaries that break down also. The relationship between the teacher and the material changes

in Phase 4 because the material is so non-traditional and includes so much that we have never studied before that the teacher becomes less of an expert. The relationship between the teacher and the student changes because the teacher now seems less "high" and the student less "low" in knowledge about the areas of life being studied. Then, in addition, there is less of a distinction between the "observer" and the "observed," and often the "subject" of study is treated, in Phase 4 work, as a primary authority on her own experience. That is, economists doing really good work on women will listen very seriously to what a housewife wants to say about spending and then borrow from Psychology and Religion and Sociology to analyze her spending patterns and perceptions, rather than trying to fit her into an intricate economic model already built, which could account for her behavior in terms of a number of variables which have already been identified but not by her.

The pinnacles of fragmented and isolated knowledge seem more and more abstract and irrelevant as you try to learn from within women's experience what women's experience has been like. Phase 1 reinforces vertical value systems; Phase 4 reveals systems of lateral values and relationships. One key hallmark of Phase 4 consciousness and curriculum is that the Other stops being considered something lesser to be dissected, deplored, devalued or corrected. The Other becomes, as it were, organically connected to one's self. Realities, like people, seem plural but unified. That fragmentation of knowledge which characterizes our disciplines at present begins to end if you descend to the valleys of civilization in Phase 4 and you start to study commonality, plural experience and the work of daily survival. You also come to realize that

the valleys are in fact more suitable places to locate civilization than are the deoxygenated summits of the mountains. The heights of specialization, like the concentration of economic power in the hands of a few are seen to have questionable usefulness to our continued survival.

One danger of Phase 3 and 4 work is that scholars trying to alter the structures of knowledge or society make the mistake of thinking that all women are alike, so that the study of a few will suffice to fill in the picture. Minority women in particular have often stated that Women's Studies tends to fall into some of the same traps as the traditional curriculum in describing chiefly the elites and the worlds they control, or in polarizing the elites and non-elites along bi-polar lines.

When well done, Phase 4 work honors particularity at the same time it identifies common denominators of experience. It stresses diversity and plurality, and for many people doing work on women in Phase 4, William James's Varieties of Religious Experience seems like a model book. It takes the pluralistic view that there are many varieties of religious life, and that one needn't rank and judge them. It shows a cast of mind which also accompanies serious work on women.

Now, Phase 5 curriculum revision is the hardest to conceive. I said it was the phase in which History (or Knowledge) gets redefined, reconstructed to include us all. But how can this be done? At a conference in 1981 for college deans and presidents held at the Johnson Foundation's Wingspread Center in Wisconsin, Gerda Lerner gave the keynote address on "Liberal Education and the New Scholarship on Women." After her talk, I

asked, "On the basis of all the work you have now done on American women's history and on the experience of Black Americans, how would you organize a basic text called American History?" She answered, "I couldn't begin to do that; it is too early. It would take a team of us, fully funded, two years just to get the table of contents organized -- just to imagine how we would categorize it." And then she said, "But don't worry, we were 6,000 years carefully building a patriarchal structure of knowledge, and we've had only 12 years to try to correct it, and 12 years is nothing."

As Elizabeth Minnich has pointed out, there have been important movements, to do and to institutionalize women's scholarship in earlier decades, so this isn't only a 12-year effort. But Lerner's larger point is important. We have had only a little time to correct major paradigms. We don't know yet what reconstructed History would look like. In my view, the reconstructed curriculum not only draws a line around the vertical and lateral functions, examining all of human life and perception. It also puts these horizontal and vertical elements in a revolutionary new relation to one another, so that the pyramidal shapes of the psyche, the society, the world are discarded, seen as inaccurate and also incompatible with the decent, balanced survival of human psyches, institutions, and nations. Global shapes replace the pyramids. Human collaborative potential is explored and competitive potential subjected to a sustained critique. A genuinely inclusive curriculum, based on global imagery of self and society, would reflect and reinforce the common human abilities and inclinations to cultivate the soil of the valleys and to collaborate for survival.

A teacher doing work in Phase 5 develops inclusive rather than exclusive vision and realizes that many things hang together. A Phase 5 curriculum would help us to produce students who can see patterns of life in terms of systems of race, culture, caste, class, gender, religion, national origin, geographical location and other influences on life which we haven't begun to name. At the same time, Phase 5 curriculum promises to produce students who can carry with them into public life the values of the private sphere, because inclusive learning allows them to value lateral functions rather than discredit them in the context of paid or public life. Right now, Phase 2 thinking tends to work only for the promotion of individual values; it tends to advance a few women who can "make it in the public world." But I think that putting women's bodies into high places does little for people in the aggregate and little or nothing for women in the aggregate. It makes life nice for, or brings power to, a few women but it doesn't necessarily bring about social change. At present our so-called "leaders," women included, are mostly working from that misguided world view that says either you win or you lose. It's not true, and women in the aggregate know it's not true. And the conviction that you either win or lose is, as I have said, a very dangerous ethic and prescription to carry into public life and into leadership positions at a time when nuclear weapons are what you have to test the idea with.

We can't afford to have leaders who think only in terms of winning or losing. And so it seems to me critically important for us to develop a Phase 5 curriculum. But lest you think I am forgetting the educational world in my interest in world peace, let me say that the development of

Phase 5 curriculum is also important to colleges and universities because of their own educational claims. The university claims to develop and to pass on to students and to the wider society an accurate and comprehensive body of knowledge. And in the words of Ruth Schmidt, the Provost of Wheaton College, and now President of Agnes Scott College, "If you claim to teach about the human race, and you don't know anything about half the human race, you really can't claim to know or teach much about the human race." The main argument for curriculum change is that it will help universities to fulfill their acknowledged primary responsibility: to develop and pass on to the society and to students accurate bodies of knowledge. Since women are now left out, those bodies of knowledge are grossly inaccurate.

I want now to illustrate these five interactive phases of curriculum development in five specific disciplines. While I was writing this part of my talk, discipline by discipline, abstractly analyzing Psychology, English, and so on, I heard the voice of Florence Howe asking her familiar question, "Where are the women?" So I stopped organizing my ideas according to those fragmented peaks and pinnacles called "disciplines," and began mentally to follow a group of women like ourselves studying in a variety of curricula from the most exclusive to the most inclusive I could imagine, and then I watched the effects on their minds and their lives. These women are named Meg, Amy, and Jo, and Jo's children: Maya and Angela and Adrienne.

Meg feels extremely privileged to go to college and to sit at the feet of her professors. Her Phase One freshman English class is called "Man's Quest for Knowledge." She studies Huckleberry Finn,

Moby Dick, Walt Whitman's poetry, Emerson on "Self Reliance," Thoreau's Walden, a Hemingway novel and Norman Mailer. Meg thinks it really is amazing when you think about it, how man has quested for knowledge; it's a universal trait! The expository essays are very difficult for Meg to write, and she cannot remember after she's handed them in what any of them were about. She gets middling grades; her professors find her indecisive. In Medieval History she studies bishops and kings. She wonders once or twice, but doesn't ask, why the serfs stood for the feudal system. Mostly she hopes that she will marry a strong man who will take care of her just as a bishop or a king must have taken care of the serfs.

In Psychology, Meg learns of a number of interesting complexes, and she feels particularly glad that she has studied the Oedipus complex because it will help her as a parent, some day, to understand her sons. In Freud's model of the personality she identifies strongly with the superego. She is very relieved that there is a part of the personality with which she can identify as a beautiful soul, one who has transcended the moiling, toiling world and the need to compete. She overlooks the fact that Freud did not think women had highly developed superegos. She is vulnerable, deluded, and ignorant about what Freud really said, since she has received no training in looking for herself in the curriculum.

In Biology, having been told that man has mastered nature and that knowledge is mastery, Meg dissects a frog. She finds this repulsive, but necessary for Science. After all, Scientists would have to take life apart in order to understand it, wouldn't they? Mostly she dreams of security, and will succeed in marrying, at the end of her junior year, her lab partner. In Art History, which is Meg's favorite course, she moves

away from that bewildering world which really hasn't made much sense to her and looks at beautiful things. She really respects her art professor, a kindly man who is teaching her what to admire in the great masters' work. She hopes that when she and her husband have raised their children and have some extra money, they can themselves collect some beautiful works of art for the walls of their house. She would, however, not want to collect second-rate art, so that may be a problem.

Amy goes to college a few years after Meg. Amy talks a lot about role models. Amy intends to Make It. She says things like "My mother never did anything." Amy's freshman English course is called "The Individual versus Society." She studies Huckleberry Finn, Moby Dick, Walt Whitman's poetry, Emerson's "Self Reliance," Thoreau's Walden, The Autobiography of Frederick Douglass, Hemingway, Kerouac and Sylvia Plath. This is a Phase 2 course; there is a black writer and a woman on the reading list. The curriculum has started to change to include a few "exceptional" members of minority groups who are considered capable of "making it" in the syllabus. Amy gets a lot of "ammunition" for her life from Sylvia Plath's character in The Bell Jar who says, "I didn't want to be the platform that the man shoots off from; I wanted to be the rocket myself and shoot off in all directions." Amy is fueled by Esther Greenwood's words to drive herself to exceptional heights. She doesn't notice that the speaker, like Plath herself, was suicidal. She is identifying upward, and she likes the Medieval/Renaissance course best when it moves from that static feudal system into the development of guilds, and the middle class, and upward mobility. She is psychologically

tuned into the theme of individual autonomy that is running through that part of the course.

In her Women in Psychology course, Phase 2, she learns about women who "made it" in Psychology. She learns nothing of their struggles nor of the many who have remained invisible to us. "They did it, I can too," Amy believes. "Women can do whatever they want, if they want anything enough to really work for it. Of course Biology isn't destiny." Amy is, however, very little interested in the psychology of women, and her courses don't give her anything to make her interested in her own psychology, or make her ask why she has switched from pre-law to art or wonder about any inner life in women which psychological research hasn't named.

In her Biology course, she is interested in Darwin's theories about competition and the "survival of the fittest." She thinks of herself as one of the "fittest." The losers will lose, but she, Amy, is going to make it in a man's world. She thinks of herself as a Frederick Douglass, "smart enough to get away," and as an organism ready to adapt to a particular niche in the environment, her niche; she intends to fight for her niche.

Amy's Art History work further demonstrates to her that women have now "arrived," because her Impressionists course includes Mary Cassatt and Berthe Morisot. Amy does not notice that they are called "Mary" and "Berthe" throughout the course, whereas the men are "Monet" and "Degas." All of Amy's eloquent papers in her freshman year in every course are variations on the theme of "The Individual vs Society." She never sees herself as "Society." Amy has been given the Phase 2 vision of herself

as the unique woman rising up in history and leaving her mother behind where mothers really always were.

Jo comes to college later than Amy, tired and rather battered by certain personal episodes in her life. She comes reluctantly to college for further training; she is a "re-entry" woman. She finds to her surprise that college speaks to her condition. She comes alive in class. Other students like to be with Jo and Jo likes to be with them. She is somewhat older than most around her. In her freshman English course she reads Dale Spender's Man Made Language and she reads Nancy Henley and Barrie Thorne, and then she reads Emily Dickinson and is invited to take an interdisciplinary look at Emily Dickinson after having read five other feminist critics. She writes a paper she will never forget, on Emily Dickinson as a person working on many rebellions at the same time -- against the social mores and axioms of her community, against patriarchal, public "authorities," against intellectual certainty, against the theology of her church, and against conventions of the sentence and of language itself. She will never forget this paper; it actually possesses her while she writes it. Somewhere in the curriculum she is finding something that speaks to her personally and directly about her own life.

In Medieval History, Jo's teacher introduces her to the essay by Joan Kelly-Gadol: "Did Women Have a Renaissance?" She gets mad, particularly when learning the answer is "No, not in the Renaissance," and she determines to mistrust periodization of history from then on. She has found something that fits with her sense of not having fitted in. She is being given the "doubled vision" which Joan Kelly refers to in one of her last works, of both fitting in and being alien and apart from a

dominant culture. She is being given the enabling doubled vision that explains her life to her.

Then in Psychology Jo reads Naomi Weisstein on "How Psychology Constructs the Female," and Carol Gilligan. In a time warp, Jo has just received Gilligan's latest book, In a Different Voice. She reads that women don't fit the existing models of moral development and that they really seem to test out differently. She learns that Lawrence Kohlberg's "Six Universal Phases" are not after all universal but were based on a small white male sample. But because Jo is in a Phase 3 curriculum, she is also told that Gilligan's sample has its limits too. She learns that women are probably more diverse than most of the existing research shows. She reads Berger and Luckmann's The Social Construction of Reality and learns that the world of "knowledge" was constructed by cultural authority figures. She finds herself almost insouciant in starting to write a paper now.

In Biology, she reads Ruth Hubbard's essay, "Have Only Men Evolved?" She is shocked to learn that scientific knowledge is permeated with politics. She learns that accounts of evolution and of human propensities which she had taken as objective are completely androcentric. She learns that all forms of female life have been seen as defective or incapacitated versions of male life. She can hardly bear to think that even Science is not objective, but as her distress grows she finds herself grateful to Ruth Hubbard for a metaphor which explains her distress to her: she looks out the back window of a bus and sees that she is herself pushing the bus in which she is riding.

And then in her Art History course Jo, in another time warp, goes

to New York City and sees Mary Beth Edelman's work, filled with anger and expressiveness and female nudity. Jo is shaken but not revolted. She invites Amy who lives in New York, to join her at the show. Amy is patronizing; Jo has nothing much to say but is moved by the show in ways she cannot express.

Some time later, Jo's children come to college. They are twins. She has named them Maya and Angela, not by accident. Their freshman English course isn't in English at all. It is in Spanish. They need Spanish for an oral history project they are doing. In my fantasy they are at college at Humboldt State. They are spending a great deal of time becoming proficient in Spanish, and moreover, their final exams in the Spanish Language and Composition course are not only on the way they read and write the language but also on their ability to elicit information from others in Spanish, their ability to understand what they have heard, and their ability to carry on a conversation in Spanish, linking on to previous things said rather than directing the talk or making statements.

In the History component of their curriculum, these twins have a project in which they are doing oral history research with six Spanish-speaking women. It started to be the history of migrant labor in a certain part of northern California but the students persuaded the professor not to label it a history of migrant labor before they had interviewed these women, lest they narrow the canvas too much. The students have decided that right now it will be an open-ended series of interviews and the topic will not be named. They will ask the women about their lives rather than asking them about migrant labor history; then they'll see where the women start.

In Psychology, Maya and Angela read Jean Baker Miller's Toward a New Psychology of Women and they feel they have been invited on an exploration with her, to try to name all of that women's experience in us that doesn't come under the public spotlight and hasn't yet been focused on or seen to exist. They also read Caroll Smith-Rosenberg's essay, "The Female World of Love and Ritual: Relations Between Women in Nineteenth Century America," and see what a rich world is revealed when you look at women's lives starting from women's own ground. They begin to care about their mother's letters and their mother's past in a new way, and begin to understand why their mother named their sister Adrienne.

In Biology, Maya and Angela take a course called "A Feeling for the Organism: Science Without Mastery," read Evelyn Fox Keller's book of this title and Barbara McClintock's work on genetics in a field of corn. The course syllabus opens with a remark of McClintock's on receiving the Nobel Prize: "It might seem unfair to reward a person for having so much pleasure over the years, asking the maize plant to solve specific problems and then watching its responses."

Last of all, in Art, Maya and Angela have a terrific project and they are having a lot of fun doing it. They have two assignments in Art. Humboldt State, in my fantasy, has a big art building whose front hall is decorated by a long mural made by art students. Every year a student replaces a part of the mural. Maya and Angela each have to replace a previous year's painting with a tempera painting of their own. But what are they to replace? This is where their teaching assignment comes in. In this Phase 4 curriculum every student is also a teacher. Therefore Maya and Angela have to spend part of every day teaching some

young children in a subject which they are themselves "taking." Maya and Angela have a group of 10 children working with them to decide whose work from the previous year's mural will be taken down and whose work will be replaced by Maya's and Angela's new work. How will the judgments be made? The children are doing a number of things, both talking and writing about the paintings that are to be replaced and also copying them with their own paints. Maya and Angela are teaching art at the same time they are studying art because this revised Phase 4 curriculum not only lowers the usual wall between the teacher and the taught but also alters the relationship radically. Moreover, art is construed in my fantastic Humboldt State as including decoration of all of the environment beyond walls and canvases and pieces of paper. Therefore the second art assignment which Maya and Angela and their students have is to take care of one of 30 gardens assigned to their art class and they are allowed to plant it as they like but they must then maintain it throughout the year. The children dislike this assignment very much. Maya and Angela have chosen succulents and shrubs which need pruning and cleaning up;those plants thrive in the climate of the campus. The children wish there were flowers. Maya and Angela explain why this isn't a flower garden. The children watch the flowers wilting in other people's beds and gradually learn that there is a reason to plant shrubs which strike them nevertheless as unpromising, unpretty, and unromantic.

Maya and Angela have an ambition for the years after college. Their father lives in New Hampshire. Whenever they visit him in the summers they are galled by the New Hampshire license plate. It has a slogan which reads "Live Free or Die." The more they read it, the more it annoys

them. So they are going to spend their time after college working for a few years in New Hampshire. They'll earn a living, but their aim is to change that slogan. They have a slogan they are going to try to get put in its place: "Share Life or Perish." They'll learn the political ropes, work through the legislature or lobby, or work through the state's committee system or campaign, or run for office; this is partly a lark but they're in dead earnest, and they'll give it a good try for ten years or so, as they make a living in New Hampshire. They imagine they'll have several public and professional and perhaps several private lives as well, before they're through.

Now these phases of curriculum have socialized each woman differently. Meg has been socialized to "fit in," oblivious to and therefore very vulnerable to the forces at work on and around her. Amy has been socialized to kill herself trying to be, and dreaming that she is, exceptional, different from other women, and dreaming that she will be seen as different from other women. Jo has been socialized to understand the interlocking systems that work to produce Meg's illusions, Amy's internalized misogyny, and the dangers to all of learning systems that exclude them. Maya and Angela have been educated to be quite happy with the diversity of life and canny about systems; they are able to use their anger in a way that gives them pleasure. They are real to themselves and may well become real to larger groups: a legislature, or drivers on the roads of New Hampshire. Well, what of Adrienne? Phase 5 remains for her. I dream we invent for her a circular, multi-cultural, inclusive curriculum which socializes people to be whole, balanced, and undamaged, which includes rather than excluding most parts of life, and which both

fosters a pluralistic understanding and fulfills the dream of a common language. This is the Phase 5 curriculum.

Ten years after graduation Meg, deserted, divorced, and still not knowing what hit her re-enters college as a Continuing Education student and now again reads the Masterworks of Western Civilization. She finds them not so great. She has learned that the bishops and kings do not take care of the serfs. She is bewildered, amazed by Jo's girls, Maya and Angela. She is in one course with them. They say things she couldn't have imagined at their age. She admires them, she likes them, and to her amazement, she is learning from them.

Amy does all right in New York as an artist; she is tough as nails, lonely, and scornful of the women's groups. She hasn't joined any collective. She's furious that she hasn't had her own show yet. She thinks if you're good enough you'll get recognized and that if women would only pull "their" act together and stop bitching, her chances for recognition would improve. Jo feels more and more whole and effective as her life goes on. She is past her first self-directed anger and her years from 40 onward are her best; she has herself learned to see systemically and become a force for personal and for aggregate change.

Maya and Angela -- will they change the New Hampshire license plate? But wait -- they haven't yet gone to college. We haven't yet got the Phase 4 curriculum. And the Phase 5 curriculum has not yet been invented for Adrienne. So the answer about what Maya and Angela and Adrienne will be able to do lies in us, and in the work we do now for their future and for ours.

This talk was originally prepared for the Claremont College Conference "Traditions & Transitions: Women's Studies and a Balanced Curriculum," in February 1983. Altered or expanded versions have been given at conferences or workshops at St. Olaf College, Mills College, University of California at Hayward, Wheaton College, Sarah Lawrence College, University of Idaho, Old Dominion University, Haverford College, the University of Maine at Farmington, Wellesley College and the National Women's Studies Association. Sections of the talk have been included in presentations at secondary schools, the Headmistresses' Association of the East and the National Association of Independent Schools.